DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 641 CG 010 982

AUTHOR Snow, Jerry; And Others
TITLE Tutorial Assistance Program. Evaluation (Spring 1975).
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Office of the Dean of Students.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 45p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *College Students; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Predictor Variables; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Student Ability; *Tutorial Programs; *Tutoring; *Tutors

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the Tutorial Assistance Program evaluation was to determine the impact of tutoring on student achievement and academic abilities. Three questionnaires were completed by 178 males and 163 females at the University of Texas at Austin who received tutoring in the 1975 spring semester. One questionnaire was completed prior to tutoring and two after tutoring, one being an ananymous evaluation of their tutors' effectiveness. Major findings were: (1) tutor's sense of humor predicted course grade at the .05 significance level; (2) the greater the number of hours the student spent in tutoring, the higher his/her course grade was likely to be; (3) although tutor effectiveness variables alone did not predict student success or failure in their courses, a combination of GPA and tutor patience, dependability and sense of humor did; and (4) tutoring seemed to be more highly predictive of course grade than overall GPA, indicating the effectiveness of tutoring. The major conclusion was that tutoring helped students to perform at their usual level in particularly troublesome courses, although improvement in a given course was difficult to evaluate. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133641

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION (SPRING 1975)

Jerry Snow, William A. Bryan
Susan Ohm, Bernie D. Yancey
Peggy Barr, Nancy D. Dittmar

RB--TAP-021275

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Wm. A. Bryan
Dean of Students
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

DEAN OF STUDENTS OFFICE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

CG010 982

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Methodology	3
Sample	3
Instruments	4
Procedure	5
Presentation of Data	6
Questions	6
Discussion	21
Findings and Implications	26
Findings	26
Implications for Future Programming	29
Implications for Future Program Evaluation	29
Selected References	30
Appendices	31
Appendix A - Enrollment Form	32
Appendix B - Exit Evaluation Form	34
Appendix C - Tutor Evaluation Form	35
Appendix D - Student Tutor Evaluation	36

TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM EVALUATION

SPRING 1975

Jerry Snow, William A. Bryan, Susan Ohm,
Bernie D. Yancey, Peggy Barr, Nancy D. Dittmar

Historically, academic assistance in colleges and universities has been the domain of either faculty advisors or a counseling center. By allocating staff time for the development of instruction in the basic reading and study skills necessary for a successful learning experience, counseling centers have provided a fertile ground for the development of specialized learning centers. As the amount of staff time allocated by the counseling center for academic assistance increased, a separate program with staff and facilities of its own often developed. A good example of this type of program development is the Reading and Study Skills Laboratory (RASSL), a program component of the Counseling-Psychological Services Center, at U.T. Austin.

Another type of academic assistance often offered at the college level is tutoring, i.e., course-related assistance. The Tutorial Assistance Program (TAP), at U.T. Austin, developed to assist the student who is encountering difficulty in specific courses, is a blending of services and programs of the Office of the Dean of Students and RASSL. A RASSL staff member, who has a joint appointment with the Special Services Program in the Office of the Dean of Students, is responsible for the development and implementation of the training program for student tutors and tutor consultants.

Students seeking tutorial assistance are seen in an intake interview designed to assess their learning difficulty prior to assignment or referral.

Although TAP may be utilized by any U.T. Austin student who is in need of tutoring, the primary target populations are the economically disadvantaged, the physically disabled, veterans, and minority students.

The Dean of Students Office and the Counseling-Psychological Services Center share the task of aiding students in their development. Both agencies ascribe to the preventative developmental model for student services. This model aims at developing competencies needed by the individual to obtain success in his/her life, rather than responding only to crisis resolution (Oetting, 1967; Morriall & Hurst, 1971). The essential view of the developmental model is that if students are equipped with the necessary skills to succeed, the outcome of success becomes cumulative, and the student will continue his/her own development.

Statement of the problem

Given the lack of relevant research on tutoring and tutoring programs, the importance of a thorough evaluation of the Tutorial Asssistance Program is evident. A growing body of program data is essential for future planning, training, and evaluation of the delivery of learning support services.

The Spring 1975 Tutorial Assistance Program evaluation attempted to assess the program's effectiveness during the 1975 spring semester. The main purpose of this study was to determine the impact of tutoring on student achievement and academic abilities. Specifically, this study attempted to determine:

1. What was the relationship between the student's initial problem, tutoring, and achievement?

2. What were the tutors' perceptions of their training, the students with whom they worked, and their personal development while working with TAP?

3. What were the students' perceptions of their tutors, the help they received, and their academic ability after tutoring?

Methodology

Included in this section are a description of the sample, a discussion of instruments used, and an outline of methods.

Sample

The sample consisted of 178 male students and 163 female students who received tutoring through the Tutorial Assistance Program during the 1975 spring semester. Table 1 presents the sex and ethnicity of students who utilized the Tutorial Assistance Program (TAP) during the 1975 spring semester. The students participating in TAP during the 1975 spring semester were divided into subpopulations according to who paid for the tutoring services. The sub-populations are: Financial Aids (135 students), Veterans (29), Special Services (24), and Self Pay (51).

TABLE 1

Students Using Tutorial Assistance Program; Spring 1975,
By By Sex and Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Sex						Row Total	
	Male			Female				
	Number	% of Males	% of Total	Number	% of Males	% of Total	Number	% of Ethnicity
Anglo	92	51.7	26.9	68	41.5	19.9	160	46.8
Black	30	16.8	8.8	44	26.8	12.9	74	21.6
Mexican American	54	30.3	15.8	47	28.6	13.7	101	29.3
Oriental	0	-	-	1	0.6	0.3	1	0.3
Other	2	1.1	0.6	4	2.4	1.2	6	1.8
Column Total	178	99.9[a]		164	100.1[a]		342	99.8[a]
Percent of Total			52.1			48.0	342	100.0

[a] Values vary from 100 due to rounding error.

Instruments

The four questionnaires provided the primary sources of data. The first of these questionnaires was an intake form (pre-tutoring) which was completed by the student upon entering the program. This questionnaire provided several pre-tutoring measures: (a) assessment of incoming concerns, (b) a measure of the student's perceptions of his own study abilities, and (c) demographic information on the student, and (d) information about the course in which the student was seeking help. The demographic information included such variables as classification, ethnicity, and population. Population refers to sources of funds for tutoring; i.e., Financial Aid, Veterans, Special Services or Self-Pay. An assessment by the student of his course grade upon seeking tutoring was also obtained (Grade Entering).

The second questionnaire as completed by students upon exit from the program (post-tutoring data). It provided data such as: (a) whether or not the student would return, (b) would students recommend TAP to their friends, (c) how helpful students thought tutoring was, (d) what grade students expected in the course, (e) were student expectations met, and (f) did students feel their academic abilities improved due to tutoring.

The third questionnaire was completed by the student anonymously upon exit from the program. Students were asked to rate their tutor(s) on eight variables related to tutoring effectiveness. The mean rating for each tutor by his students was considered a tutor effectiveness variable.

The fourth questionnaire was completed by each tutor and was used to indicate the tutors' perceptions of their students, themselves, their training, and the program. This evaluation questionnaire was completed at the close of the semester. Samples of these questionnaires are found in the appendices.

Procedure

Four tutor consultants worked with TAP during the 1974-75 academic year. They were upper division or graduate students with outstanding academic records. Tutor consultants were responsible for the initial interview, diagnostic work, and assignment to tutoring for all students requesting assistance. In addition, they supervised student tutors and assisted in the implementation of the student tutor training program.

All tutors received an orientation to TAP procedures and philosophy of learning prior to being assigned as a tutor. Ongoing training for each tutor consisted of at least one individual consultation session with a tutor consultant, one subject area meeting, and two group tutor meetings during the 1975 spring semester.

Each tutor was evaluated by his students on the tutor effectiveness questionnaire. A mean score on each variable for each tutor was used as a variable called "tutoring effectiveness". Tutoring effectiveness is considered an intervention variable.

Tutor training emphasized an attitude of flexibility toward the three essential components of the tutoring process: (a) planning or preparation; (b) teaching, helping, or coaching, and (c) evaluation or assessment.

Students met one hour weekly with their tutor until they no longer requested assistance. In instances where student need was greater, more than one hour a week of tutoring was scheduled. Only in a few instances did students meet sporadically with their tutors.

The facilities for tutoring were small insulated compartments, hall tables, or classrooms available within the Speech Building at the University of Texas. The student and tutor had their choice of these areas.

Appointments were scheduled initially by intake staff (tutor consultants) at a mutually convenient time for student and tutor between 10:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. Monday through Friday. Subsequent appointments were made by the student and tutor at the close of each session. Assignment of a student to a tutor was done primarily on the basis of schedule compatibility.

Presentation of Data

In addition to the data from the questionnaires, several other measures were acquired at the end of the semester for each of the students in the program. These measures include semester and cumulative grade point averages, the number of hours of tutoring per student per course, and the final grade in each course for which the student sought help (final course grade). Except for the hours of tutoring, obtained from tutor's payroll voucher, the information was obtained from student records maintained by the University. The final course grade was considered the primary criterion variable in this study and was used to indicate success or impact of the tutoring.

The relevance of the obtained data to the questions which were asked is considered in the following section. Summaries of the data and statistical analyses performed are presented with respect to each of the questions asked. Only the .01 and .05 levels of statistical significance will be referred to in the presentation.

Questions

1. Will tutoring effectiveness and number of hours of tutoring be a better predictor of the students' final grade in the course than population, classification or initial problem in the course?

Discriminant analysis and analysis of variance were used to determine the nature of the relationships between final course grade and (a) the tutor effectiveness variables and (b) hours of tutoring. An analysis of variance for final grade in the course (A,B,C,D,F) and tutor effectiveness variables showed that only the variable "sense of humor" significantly contributed to the determination of course grade at the .05 level. Hours of tutoring was also a significant predictor of final course grade at the .02 level or less. More hours of tutoring resulted in a higher course grade. A summary of the means for these two variables broken down by final course grade is found in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Means For Sense Of Humor And Hours Tutoring
Broken Down By Final Course Grade

Grade	Sense of Humor *		Hours of Tutoring **	
	Number of students	Mean[a]	Number of students	Mean
A	15	3.61	16	4.13
B	40	3.77	43	3.30
C	59	3.58	69	3.17
D	28	3.49	33	3.12
F	19	3.43	22	3.14

[a] Scale: 1-4, 1-unsatisfactory, 4-very satisfactory
* $F = 2.737$ p .05
** $F = 3.0775$ p .02

The students were then divided into two groups, successful (A,B,C) and unsuccessful (D,F) according to final course grade. A subsequent discriminant analysis using only tutor effectiveness variables to predict successful or unsuccessful students was nonsignificant. However, the results of a stepwise discriminant analysis indicated that in conjunction with semester grade point

average and course grade upon seeking tutoring, the tutor effectiveness variables produced a discriminant function which correctly predicted 38 of 58 unsuccessful students and 141 of 141 successful students. Thus overall, a 90% correct prediction was realized. The tutor effectiveness variables which significantly contributed to prediction accuracy were patience, sense of humor and dependability.

Question 1 was tested by a Chi-Square analysis. The variables used were population (who paid for tutoring), classification, and initial problem. None of the Chi-squares were significant. Coupled with previous findings, hours of tutoring, semester grade point average, entering course grade and three tutor effectiveness variables (--patience, sense of humor, and dependability--) are better predictors of final course grade than either population, classification, or initial problems presented.

2. Will tutoring effectiveness (students' ratings of tutors) be more highly related to the students' course grade than to their overall grade point average?

An analysis of variance was performed to determine how well the tutor effectiveness variables would function as predictors of overall grade point average (A,B,C,D,F). None of the comparisons proved significant. These results along with the previously reported results of an analysis of variance for tutor effectivensss variables and final course grade do not present enough evidence to conclusively resolve the question. A resolution to this question is further hindered due to the positive relationship between overall grade point average and final course grade as demonstrated in Table 3. However, since tutor effectiveness variable ratings are more highly correlated with course grade than with overall grade point average (Table 3), there is some evidence to indicate a

slightly stronger relationship between the tutor effectiveness variables and final course grade than between tutor effectiveness variables and overall grade point average.

3. Will post-tutoring grades (final course grade) be significantly higher than pre-tutoring grades (course grade upon seeking tutoring)?

The small n involved (n=10 for course grade upon entering tutoring) and the existence of zero cells in a Chi-square analysis makes the results non-interpretable. Therefore, Table 4 is presented for information only.

TABLE 3

Intercorrelation Of Treatment And Outcome Variables For TAP Students

Variables	1[a]	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Grade entering	1.00													
2 Final grade	-.791** (n=7)	1.00												
3 Number of hours tutoring	.459 (n=7)	.176** (n=183)	1.00											
Tutor effectiveness														
4 Knowledge of subject area	.159 (n=7)	.082 (n=162)	.071 (n=195)	1.00										
5 Flexibility	.259 (n=7)	.089 (n=161)	.078 (n=194)	.718** (n=208)	1.00									
6 Patience	.161 (n=7)	.150* (n=161)	.184** (n=194)	.414** (n=208)	.521** (n=208)	1.00								
7 Sense of humor	.162 (n=7)	.207** (n=161)	.273** (n=194)	.307** (n=208)	.321** (n=208)	.667** (n=208)	1.00							
8 Stimulating	-.126 (n=7)	.086 (n=161)	.045 (n=194)	.439** (n=208)	.705** (n=208)	.505** (n=208)	.285** (n=208)	1.00						
9 Encouraged independence	.252 (n=7)	.119 (n=161)	.239** (n=194)	.533** (n=208)	.698** (n=208)	.574** (n=208)	.710** (n=208)	.650** (n=208)	1.00					
10 Dependable	.259 (n=7)	.026 (n=161)	.033 (n=194)	.140* (n=208)	.215** (n=208)	-.001 (n=208)	-.033 (n=208)	.061 (n=208)	.228** (n=208)	1.00				
11 Understanding	.245 (n=7)	.164* (n=161)	.088 (n=194)	.211** (n=208)	.584** (n=208)	.481** (n=208)	.372** (n=208)	.728** (n=208)	.536** (n=208)	.006 (n=208)	1.00			
12 Equality	.245 (n=7)	.106 (n=161)	.055 (n=194)	.040 (n=208)	.674** (n=207)	.561** (n=207)	.370** (n=207)	.759** (n=207)	.562 (n=207)	.105 (n=207)	.753 (n=207)	1.00		
13 Semester GPA	-.159 (n=7)	.741** (n=198)	.088 (n=248)	.056 (n=209)	.010 (n=208)	.169 (n=208)	.059 (n=208)	.045 (n=208)	.014 (n=208)	.023 (n=208)	.024 (n=208)	.037 (n=208)	1.00	
14 Overall GPA	-.252 (n=7)	.647** (n=198)	.092 (n=248)	.034 (n=209)	-.028 (n=208)	.012 (n=208)	-.018 (n=208)	-.006 (n=208)	-.057 (n=208)	.016 (n=208)	.023 (n=208)	.008 (n=208)	.681** (n=226)	1.00

[a] Kendall's Tau used due to small n for grade entering only.

* p .05

** p .01

TABLE 4

Final Course Grades By Course Grade Upon Entering Tutoring

Entering Course Grade	Final Course Grade D	C	B	A	Row Total
C	0	0	2	0	2
B	0	3	0	1	4
A	0	2	0	0	2
CR	1	1	0	0	2
Column Total	1	6	2	1	10

Chi-square = 15.42 df = 9

4. Will there be a significantly higher number of initial problems presented by Special Services students than by the other populations?

Data related to this question are presented in Table 5. The Chi-square was not significant.

TABLE 5

Tabulation Of The Number Of Initial Problems By Students From Four Populations Served By Tutorial Assistance Program

Number of Initial Problems	Population: Financial Aid Students #	% of Pop	% of Total	Veterans #	% of Pop	% of Total	Special Services Students #	% of Pop	% of Total	Self Pay #	% of Pop	% of Total	Total #	Total %
0	30	22.2	12.6	4	13.8	1.7	5	20.8	2.1	7	13.7	2.9	46	19.2
1	8	5.9	3.3	3	10.3	1.3	0	0.0	0.0	3	5.9	1.3	14	5.8
2	14	10.4	5.9	2	6.9	0.8	0	0.0	0.0	6	11.8	2.5	22	9.2
3	21	15.6	8.8	6	20.7	2.5	5	20.8	2.1	8	15.7	3.3	40	16.7
4	16	11.9	6.7	4	13.8	1.7	4	16.7	1.7	8	15.7	3.3	32	13.4
5	17	12.6	7.1	2	6.9	0.8	2	8.3	0.8	8	15.7	3.3	29	12.1
6	29	21.5	12.1	8	27.6	3.3	8	33.3	3.3	11	21.6	4.6	56	23.4
Total	135	100.1[a]	56.5	29	100.0	12.1	24	99.9[a]	10.0	51	100.1[a]	21.2	239	99.8[a]
Mean Number of Problems For Population	3.125			3.413			3.708			3.470			3.292	

Chi-square = 11.552 df = 18

Note: Populations were defined according to the agency paying for tutorial assistance.

[a] Values vary from 100 due to rounding error.

5. Will there be a significant difference in the kind of problems presented by the different populations?

The results in Table 6 indicate that the kinds of problems presented by the different populations are essentially similar and do not differ by population. The Chi-square result was not significant. The number of zero scores and near zero scores should be noted in interpreting these results.

6. Will there be a significant positive relationship between tutors' perception of their own improved academic abilities and (a) perceptions of their training, (b) perceptions of the helpfulness of tutoring to their students, and (c) their utilization of study skills materials.

The data presented in Table 7 show that while both the perceived helpfulness of tutoring and utilization of training materials are significantly associated with tutor improved academic abilities, the training program itself was not.

Table 8 shows tutor rankings as to usefulness for several sources of their learning. Tutors considered the students they tutored, subject area meetings, and textbooks as the most useful sources of learning. They considered other tutors, study skills books, and tapes as the least useful sources of learning for them (all three were rated under 3, on a scale of 1-5). Program sources of learning were all rated as useful (Table 8).

TABLE 6

Type Of Initial Problem Presented By Number[a] Of Students In Each Of Four Populations Served By TAP

Kind of Initial Problem	Population Classification: No Identification		Financial Aids		Veterans		Special Services		Self Pay		Row Total	
	#	Pop %	#	Pop %	#	Pop %	#	Pop %	#	Pop %	#	Row %
Previous schooling	1	5.6%	26	6.2%	3	3.0%	6	6.7%	10	5.7%	46	5.7%
Absence from academia	1	5.6%	14	3.3%	7	7.1%	6	6.7%	8	4.5%	36	4.5%
General difficulties with this type of course	2	11.1%	46	10.9%	12	12.1%	11	12.4%	21	1.9%	92	11.4%
New terminology	1	5.6%	20	4.7%	10	10.1%	3	3.4%	12	6.8%	46	5.7%
Understanding new concepts	0	0.0%	48	11.4%	14	14.1%	9	10.1%	20	11.4%	91	11.3%
Application of information learned	2	11.1%	65	15.4%	16	16.2%	12	13.5%	22	12.5%	117	14.6%
General requirements of this course	1	5.6%	7	1.7%	5	5.1%	3	3.4%	5	2.8%	21	2.6%
Reading and understanding assignment	2	11.1%	12	2.8%	3	3.0%	6	6.7%	7	4.0%	30	3.7%
Listening and taking notes	0	0.0%	13	3.1%	0	0.0%	2	2.2%	4	2.3%	19	2.4%
Organizing work	0	0.0%	13	3.1%	6	6.1%	2	2.2%	1	0.6%	22	2.7%
Memory	0	0.0%	24	5.7%	3	3.0%	6	6.7%	13	7.4%	46	5.7%
Grammar and/or writing skills	2	11.1%	10	2.4%	0	0.0%	3	3.4%	4	2.3%	19	2.4%
Concentration	0	0.0%	19	4.5%	2	2.0%	3	3.4%	5	2.8%	29	3.6%
Preparation and taking tests	1	5.6%	37	8.8%	5	5.1%	8	9.0%	13	7.4%	64	8.0%
Lack of self-confidence	1	5.6%	17	4.0%	3	3.0%	2	2.2%	9	5.1%	32	4.0%
Heavy work load	2	11.1%	12	2.8%	1	1.0%	0	0.0%	6	3.4%	21	2.6%
Nervous on tests	0	0.0%	10	2.4%	3	3.0%	2	2.2%	5	2.8%	20	2.5%
Medical problems	0	0.0%	2	0.5%	2	2.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%	5	0.6%
Lack of motivation	1	5.6%	3	0.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	0.5%
Difficulty in understanding the professor	1	5.6%	17	4.0%	3	3.0%	3	3.4%	8	4.5%	32	4.0%
Other	0	0.0%	7	1.7%	1	1.0%	2	2.2%	2	1.1%	12	1.5%
Total # of problems by Population	18		422		99		89		176		804	
Percent of total problems		2.2%		52.5%		12.3%		11.1%		21.9%		100.0%

Chi-square = 80.87846 df = 80

Note: Populations were defined according to the agency paying for the tutorial assistance.

[a] Students could check more than one problem.

TABLE 7

Kendall Tau Correlations For Tutors' Perceptions Of Their Own Improved Academic Abilities And (1) Training, (2) Helpfulness Of Tutoring, and (3) Utilization Of Study Skill Materials

Tutor Perceptions Of Their Own Improved Academic Abilities					
Helpfulness Training Resources		Helpfulness of Tutoring		Utilization of Study Skill Materials	
	r		r		r
Tutor's students	.022 (n=31)	Helpfulness	.361* (n=35)	Handouts	.238* (n=23)
Other tutors	.066 (n=24)			Study Skill Books	.489** (n=15)
Tutor consultants	-.003 (n=28)			Tapes	.515* (n=10)
Trainer	.153 (n=20)				
Texts	.181 (n=25)				
Orientation	-.102 (n=32)				
Group meetings	-.051 (n=30)				
Subject area meetings	.008 (n=31)				
RASSL	.349 (n=11)				

* p .05
** p .01

TABLE 8

Tutors'[a] Rankings By Usefulness Of Sources Of Learning Utilized

Source	Rankings												Mean Rank of Usefulness
	Of Little Help								Very Useful		Did Not Use[b]		
	1		2		3		4		5				
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
People													
Our Students	1	2.9	0	0.0	3	8.6	12	34.3	15	42.9	4	11.4	4.29
Other tutors	5	14.3	4	11.4	5	14.3	8	22.9	2	5.7	11	31.4	2.29
Tutor consultants	4	11.4	3	8.6	8	22.9	5	14.3	8	22.9	7	20.0	3.35
Reading and Study Skills Specialists	1	2.9	4	11.4	6	17.1	4	11.4	5	14.3	15	4.29	3.40
Materials													
Handouts	4	11.4	1	2.9	4	11.4	11	31.4	3	8.6	12	34.3	3.34
Study Skills Books	4	11.4	3	8.6	4	11.4	2	5.7	2	5.7	20	57.1	2.66
Tapes	5	14.3	1	2.9	2	5.7	1	2.9	1	2.9	25	71.4	2.20
Texts	2	5.7	4	11.4	1	2.9	8	22.9	10	28.6	10	28.6	3.80
Programs													
Orientation	1	2.9	2	5.7	10	28.6	12	34.3	7	20.0	3	8.6	3.68
First General Session	3	8.6	2	5.7	8	22.9	8	22.9	4	11.4	10	28.6	3.40
Tutor Group Meetings	3	8.6	1	2.9	9	25.7	12	34.3	5	14.3	5	14.3	3.50
Subject Area Meetings	3	8.6	2	5.7	6	17.1	11	31.4	9	25.7	4	11.4	3.74
RASSL	2	5.7	1	2.9	4	11.4	3	8.6	1	2.9	24	68.6	3.00

[a] n = 35, total
[b] was left blank if did not use

7. Will there be a significant positive relationship between tutors perceptions of how helpful tutoring was for their students and (a) tutor training, (b) modes of assessment of students, and (c) perceptions of their own improved academic abilities?

Table 9 indicates that two training variables and the tutors' improved academic abilities were significantly related to the tutors' perceptions of helpfulness of tutoring. The training variables are orientation and study skills books. Since there was no significant correlation between the tutors' rating of helpfulness of tutoring and helpfulness of modes of assessment, it appears that the tutors were evaluating the helpfulness of the tutoring for their students by means other than the ones listed in Table 9.

8. Will the student perceptions of tutor effectiveness be related to ethnicity?

Nine variables assessing tutor effectiveness resulted in only one significant ethnic difference in an analysis of variance of ethnicity by tutor effectiveness (Table 10). Only "sense of humor" was found to be significantly different. The differences between the mean "sense of humor" rating given by Chicanos and the other groups is significant (Student-Newman Keuhls Procedure). The eight other variables did not differ significantly for the different ethnic groups.

TABLE 9

Tutors' Perceptions Of How Helpful Tutoring Was To Their Students

Evaluation of sources of learning	r	Evaluation of modes of assesment of students	r	Tutor's perceived improvement of academic ability	r
Tutor's students	-.048 (n=31)	Supplementary exercises	-.214 (n=27)	Improved academic ability	.360** (n=35)
Other tutors	.1102 (n=24)	Ability to do homework	-.033 (n=32)		
Tutor consultants	.088 (n=28)	Increased interest	.106 (n=32)		
Learning study skills specialists	.197 (n=20)	Kinds of questions	-.085 (n=32)		
Handouts	.083 (n=23)	Students ability to work independently	.108 (n=26)		
Study skills books	.464 (n=15)**	Test results/ grades	-.123 (n=30)		
Tapes	.363 (n=10)				
Texts	.115 (n=25)				
Orientation	.197* (n=32)				
First main session	.114 (n=25)				
Group meetings	.024 (n=30)				
Subject area meetings	.042 (n=31)				
RASSL	.153 (n=11)				

* p .05
** p .01

TABLE 10

Analysis Of Variance Of Student's Evaluation
Of Tutors By Ethnicity Of Student

Tutor variables	Ethnicity						
	Anglos (n=68)		Blacks (n=23)		Chicanos (n=26)		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F
Knowledge of subject	3.74	.56	3.78	.51	3.65	.49	.389
Flexibility	3.55	.51	3.57	.79	3.38	.70	.526
Patience	3.89	.32	3.74	.62	3.54	.51	2.789
Sense of humor	3.90	.31	3.74	.54	3.31	.74	6.714*
Stimulating	3.53	.51	3.26	.86	3.20	.71	1.202
Encouraged independence	3.53	.51	3.48	.59	3.31	.74	.772
Dependable	3.50	.83	3.62	.67	3.52	.82	.141
Understanding	3.80	.41	3.44	.99	3.48	.80	1.352
Equality	3.63	.50	3.52	.73	3.38	.80	.690

Note: Means calculated for each tutor from each tutor's students' evaluations. (1-not satisfactory, 4-very good)

* p .002

9. Will students' perceptions (effectiveness ratings) of tutors be predictive of (related to) their ratings of the helpfulness of tutoring?

An analysis of variance was done to compare those students who viewed tutoring as more helpful (4,5) with those rating tutoring as less helpful (1,2,3) on a scale from 1-5. Students who rated tutors as more helpful also gave the tutors more favorable ratings on the tutor effectiveness variables (Table 11). This strengthens the validity of using these variables as evaluation criteria. A discriminate analysis resulted in a prediction equation which was able to predict with 89% accuracy the students' rating of the helpfulness of tutoring. Sixty-three correct predictions were made out of a possible 71.

TABLE 11

Analysis Of Variance Of Students' Perception Of Tutors
For Students Rating Tutoring As More Helpful (4,5)
Versus Less Helpful (1,2,3)

Perceptions of tutor	Student Perceptions[a]				
	More helpful (n=55)		Less helpful (n=23)		
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	F
Knowledge of subject matter	3.85	.36	3.22	.74	26.688**
Flexibility	3.65	.52	2.92	.78	24.779**
Patience	3.80	.40	3.35	.71	12.590**
Sense of humor	3.75	.52	3.25	.79	10.914**
Stimulating	3.51	.54	2.68	.89	24.804**
Encouraged independence	3.55	.57	2.96	.71	14.951**
Dependable	3.61	.71	3.23	.87	3.991*
Understanding	3.78	.46	2.88	.97	32.047**
Equality	3.67	.55	2.87	.92	22.209**

[a] n=78, total
* p .05
** p .001

10. Will students' perceptions of tutors be significantly related to the grade they expect to earn in the tutored course?

The data presented in Table 12 indicate students who expected higher grades also saw their tutor more positively while students who expected lower grades viewed their tutor less positively.

TABLE 12

Kendall Tau Correlations For Student Perceptions Of Tutors And Expected Grade In Tutored Course(s)

Tutor variables	r
Knowledge of subject matter	.5381*
Flexibility	.5386*
Patience	.3528*
Sense of humor	.4344*
Stimulation	.4661*
Encouraged independence	.4295*
Dependable	.3534*
Understanding	.5966*
Equality	.5291*

* p .001

11. Will student perceptions of their own academic abilities after tutoring be significantly improved?

No tests of significance were run on the results reported in Table 13. Student exit evaluations indicated an overall positive evaluation for the tutorial program. Table 13 shows the students' positive responses to tutoring. The students' positive responses are related to improving course grade, academic ability and the accessiblity of the service. The data seem to indicate that students feel their abilities have improved.

TABLE 13

Frequencies And Percentages Of Students' Exit Evaluation
Of Tutoring On Variables Related To Improved Abilities

Variables	Rating			
	Positive		Negative	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Expectations of tutoring met[a]	70	85.4	10	12.2
Help received was helpful[c]	71	89.0	9	11.0
Would recommend to friends[b]	72	88.9	9	11.1
Confidence in abilities increased[a]	64	80.0	16	20.0
Feel comfortable coming back to TAP[a]	80	98.9	1	1.2

Note: Mean for helpfulness of tutoring is 4.05 on a 1-5 scale (5-very helpful)
[a] scale: positive-yes, negative-no
[b] scale: positive-yes, negative-no, maybe
[c] scale: positive-3,4,5 (helpful), negative-1,2 (not helpful)

Discussion

This study basically attempted to find answers to three broad questions. The results for each of the three main questions will be discussed separately. Question one uses data which is both subjective (perceptual) and objective (grade earned) and is the primary service evaluation question.

Question 1: What is the relationship between the students initial problem, tutoring and achievement?

Tutor effectiveness variable ratings were highly favorable and thereby probably reduced real differences in the competency level of tutors. The contribution made by both tutor effectiveness ratings and number of hours of tutoring was not nearly as powerful as the students grade point average (GPA-overall or semester) in predicting course grade. The students' overall GPAs were the best predictors of course grades. This indicates the stability of GPA and its resistance to intervention.

The tutor variables of sense of humor, patience, and dependability were, however, helpful discriminators of successful and unsuccessful students. These tutor characteristics are supportive and might be viewed as factors which diminish the feelings of discouragement often experienced by students who are facing academic obstacles. Those students completing a subjective evaluation of tutoring were satisfied with the program and showed an overall comfort with their tutors and the program. Proposing a single humanistic component called "tutor effectiveness" was substantiated by a factor analysis on tutor variables which resulted in essentially one factor.

Neither the student's classification, population, nor initial problem was a significant predictor of performance.

Although no overwhelming evidence can be found for resolving the question of whether or not the tutor effectiveness variables are more closely related to final course grade than to overall grade point average, the results tend to indicate that this is the case. A failure to find more significant results could be due to the high correlation between overall grade point average and final course grade (Table 3). It should be remembered, however, that the tutor effectiveness variables were highly related to how the students viewed the "helpfulness" of the program. Such results in themselves justify a closer look at these variables with respect to their ability to measure student attitudes that might possibly be related to long term changes in their attitudes toward academic skills. A more positive attitude toward academic skills could be reflected by improved performance later in their careers.

Data in this study show no real differences in the number of initial problems and kinds of problems of the different subpopulations served by TAP. For the purpose of this program, problems expressed by less than 3% of the students

were considered general strengths of TAP's population, while those expressed by more than 7% were viewed as general weaknesses (Table 14). In the TAP training program there might be an increased concentration in the training experience on those problems most often expressed by students. Tutors could work with these self expressed problems as indication of the goals and outcome areas of concern to the student.

TABLE 14

Initial Problems Presented to TAP

Percentage of Students Expressing Problem			
Less than 3%		More than 7%	
Problem	Percentage	Problem	Percentage
General requirements of course	2.6%	General difficulties with course	11.4%
Listening and taking notes	2.4%	Understanding new concepts	11.3%
Organizing work	2.7%	Application of information learned	14.6%
Grammar and/or writing	2.4%	Preparation and taking tests	8.0%
Heavy work load	2.5%		
Nervous on tests	2.6%		
Lack of motivation	.5%		

Question 2: What are the tutors' perception of their training, students, and personal development while working with TAP?

The Tutorial Assistance Program's tutor training was not seen as a significant factor in improving the tutors' own academic abilities. However, tutors felt that the exposure to the handouts, study skills texts, and tapes did contribute to the improvement of their own abilities. This finding may indicate that when tutors attended sessions designed to help their students the tutors did not transfer this to their own world. The finding that the materials to which they

were exposed were helpful for those who used them may mean that when the tutors used the materials to answer a pre-formed question the materials became useful and were not merely a contributor to more unassimilated information.

A further exploration of RASSL's relationship to improved academic abilities is necessary to discover the impact of RASSL on tutors. RAASL's relationship to this question might be clearer if considered only with those students using the service.

The relationship between the tutors' perceived helpfulness of tutoring to their students and the tutors' own improved academic abilities is a finding which Bandura (1969) would interpret as the effects of modeling. Those tutors who are themselves open to change and are growing and integrating information act as models for growth and learning for the student.

The tutors' perceptions of the training program effectiveness is positively related to the perceived helpfulness of tutoring to students. This can be viewed as an assessment of the transferability from training to practice. Orientation appears as a significant contributor to helping tutors. Orientation explains the procedural format of TAP, the materials and supports available, a preliminary attitudinal set towards learning, tutoring, and problem solving.

The tutors' evaluations of the helpfulness of tutoring to their students was extremely skewed. One hundred percent of the tutors rated tutoring at least 3 or better on a scale of 5. The tutors, however, did not view any of the assessment techniques as indicative of how helpful tutoring was for their students. In addition, they stated no other means to evaluate the student's progress. This discrepancy indicates an intuitive manner of assessing helpfulness which may or may not be based on the tutor's experience.

Question 3: What are the students' perceptions of their tutors, the help they received, and their own academic abilities after tutoring?

Previous research (McDougall, 1974) has shown that Mexican American students rated tutoring, their tutors, and their expected grades as significantly lower than Anglo or other ethnic groups. The data in this study however did not differ significantly for ethnic groups, except for the tutor variable "sense of humor". The data indicate, however, a trend toward a depressed rating of tutors by Mexican American students which while not significant, does raise questions about the service's relationship with Mexican American students. The perceptions of students toward their tutors predict their perception of the help they received from tutoring and has implications for midterm evaluations of tutors, assignment of tutors, and hiring of tutors. Data presented in this study show "understanding" as the most important of the tutor variables, followed closely by "knowledge of subject matter" and "flexibility". These three variables are central concerns of the active tutor. To listen for understanding, to be confident with the factual information relevant to the student, and to be able to shift from one method to another to communicate information or skills are seen as paramount in helping another person overcome the obstacles of learning.

The inability of tutor variables to predict the actual grade earned may result from: (a) the small number of tutor evaluations returned, (b) a compressed rating scale, or (c) a single factorial nature of the evaluation instrument.

No statistical tests were run to determine the students' perceptions of their academic abilities after tutoring. However, data seem to indicate that the students' perceptions of their academic abilities were in fact improved (Table 13). The major focus of tutoring is on the particular course with which the student is experiencing difficulty, and a secondary emphasis is put on overall study skills. Given this information, it is noteworthy that students felt their academic ability had improved. Possibly this finding indicates the

global nature in which students respond to their environment. Research in counseling (Carkhuff, 1969) has indicated that when one area of functioning is improved to a level of competency then other areas of functioning have a tendency to improve as well.

Findings and Implications

Findings

A summary of the findings for this study follows:

1. An analysis of variance using course grades by tutor effectiveness variables found a significant difference between "sense of humor" (tutor variable) and grade for the course in which tutoring was received. It also found a significant positive relationship between hours of tutoring received and grade for the course in which tutoring was received.

2. In conjunction with the student semester grade point average, and grade upon entering the course, a prediction equation was produced which predicted whether students would be successful and unsuccessful (90% accuracy) in the course in which they received tutoring. The tutor effectiveness variables of patience, sense of humor and dependability contributed significantly to the accuracy of the prediction.

3. Tutor effectiveness variables alone did not significantly predict successful and unsuccessful students.

4. Data presented in this study indicated that neither the population from which the student was a member nor the kind of initial problem presented predicted future academic performance.

5. Tutoring effectiveness tended to be more related to the students course grade than to the student's overall grade point average.

6. Post-tutoring grades were not significantly higher than pre-tutoring grades.

7. Special Services students did not significantly differ from other populations when reporting number of initial problems. No significant differences were found in the kinds of problems presented by the different populations.

8. The tutors saw helpfulness of tutoring to students and training materials as being significantly associated with tutor skill development. However, the training program itself was not significantly related to tutor skill development.

9. The tutor training variables of Orientation, study skill books, and tutor skill development were positively related to the tutors' perceived helpfulness of tutoring to their students.

10. There was a significant difference between ethnic groups and their mean rating of "sense of humor" as an important factor in tutor effectiveness. The Mexican American students rated tutors lower on "sense of humor" than did the other ethnic groups.

11. Significant differences were found between students who viewed tutoring as more helpful and those students who viewed tutoring as less helpful and their actual ratings of the following tutor variables: knowledge of subject matter, flexibility, patience, sense of humor, stimulating, encouraged independence, dependable, understanding and equality.

12. Student perceptions of tutors were positively related to the grade they expected to earn in the tutored course.

13. Students receiving tutoring in the study perceived TAP as a program which increased their academic success, aided them in improving their own academic abilities, and assisted them in dealing with their academic problems.

Implications for Future Programming

The results from the analysis of the questions and experience with the program implicate the following:

1. Minority students should be monitored more closely in their progress and accessability to TAP in order to facilitate their use of the program.

2. RASSL and TAP programming should be more closely linked in order to maximize the utilization of both.

3. The tutoring process should incorporate student behavioral goals which can be evaluated.

4. The tutoring process should be evaluated at least midway through the contract period to allow for any necessary revisions.

5. Support service staff such as Minority Student Services and Students Older Than Average should combine time and expertise with TAP on cooperative workshops geared to those problems experienced by most students.

6. Tutor and Tutor Consultant training should be focused on the most common problems presented by students.

7. The tutor's initial training should be oriented towards the development of personal learning objectives.

8. The tutors should be hired on the basis of: (a) a favorable attitude toward growth and learning, (b) the presence of criterion referenced skills, and (c) openness to learning.

9. Orientation training should be continued with follow-up tied to individual learning objectives.

10. Follow-up training should emphasize the tutor's ability to assess student progress and develop alternate learning strategies.

Implications for Future Program Evaluations

The following suggestions are based on experience:

1. The problem identification sheet should be revised in order to incorporate more criterion referenced strengths and weaknesses relating to course grade.

2. The effects of tutoring should be studied using a designed control group and semester and/or year follow-up to assess cumulative benefits.

3. Pre-post assessment tools to determine the impact of the Tutor Consultant and Tutors on student problem identification should be developed.

4. Criterion measures of tutor training which relate to student success should be developed.

5. The impact of a student receiving a different grade than expected in terms of the student's perception of his/her own skills and TAP should be assessed.

6. A way of assessing the relative impact of RASSL and TAP and their combined effect on student skill development and academic achievement should be designed.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

Carkhuff, R. R. Helping and Human Relations: A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers. Vol. 2. Practice and Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1969.

McDougall, A. Southwestern College Tutoring Evaluation, Spring, 1974.

Menges, R. J.; Marx, R.; and Trumpeter, P. W. Effectiveness of Tutorial Assistance for High-Risk STudents in Advanced College Courses. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19, 225-230.

Morriall, W. H. and Hurst, J. C. A Preventative and Developmental Role for the College Counselor. The Counselor. The Counseling Psychologist, 1971, Vol. 2, #4, 90-95.

Oetting, E. R. A Developmental Definition of Counseling Psychology. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14.

Roueche, J. R. and Kirk, W. E. Catching-Up. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1973.

Stice, J. E. The Personalized System of Instruction: The Keller Plan Applied in Engineering Education. Bureau of Engineering Teaching Bulletin, #4, December, 1971.

Warnath, C. E. New Directions for College Counselors. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

APPENDICES

FOR OFFICE USE
Circle One

F.A. V.A.

S.S. S. Pay

ENROLLMENT FORM
TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE FORM

Office of the Dean of Students

Please fill out a schedule form in addition to the enrollment form.

Name _____ Social Security Number _____

Austin Addr_____ Major _____

_____ Classification _____

Zip _____ Ethnicity _____

Telephone _____ U.T. g.p.a.(approx.) _____

Hrs.Presently Enrolled _____

Are you currently receiving aid from Student Financial Aid?

No _____

Yes _____, please specify _____

_____

How did you learn about the tutorial assistance program? _____

_____

Course(s) for which assistance is being requested:

Course	Current Grade	Instructor	Texts

Please describe briefly the trouble you're having with each course for which assistance is being requested.

_____

_____

_____

How do you think tutoring will aid you in your course(s)?

_____

_____

_____

OPTIONAL CHECKLIST: Often students requesting tutorial assistance name one or more of the following factors as contributing to problems with a course. Please check the items below which apply to you.

This is optional - omit if you prefer

Background experience in area	Course #1 (a)	Course #2 (b)	Course #3 (c)
1. previous schooling was inadequate	1a_____	b_____	c_____
2. returning to school after being away	2a_____	b_____	c_____
3. general difficulties with this type of course	3a_____	b_____	c_____
Content of course(s)			
4. new terminology	4a_____	b_____	c_____
5. understanding new concepts	5a_____	b_____	c_____
6. application of information learned	6a_____	b_____	c_____
7. general requirements of course	7a_____	b_____	c_____
Study techniques and other factors			
8. reading the assignments	8a_____	b_____	c_____
9. listening and taking notes	9a_____	b_____	c_____
10. organizing work & study time	10a_____	b_____	c_____
11. memory	11a_____	b_____	c_____
12. grammar &/or writing skills	12a_____	b_____	c_____
13. concentration	13a_____	b_____	c_____
14. preparing for & taking tests	14a_____	b_____	c_____
15. lack of self confidence	15a_____	b_____	c_____
16. heavy work load	16a_____	b_____	c_____
17. nervous on tests	17a_____	b_____	c_____
18. medical problems	18a_____	b_____	c_____
19. lack of motivation	19a_____	b_____	c_____
20. difficulty in understanding the professor	20a_____	b_____	c_____
21. other:_____	21a_____	b_____	c_____

Signature:_____

date:_____

TUTOR CONSULTANT COMMENTS: T.C. initials_____

Background experience & current assignments:

Study Skill concerns:

Other comments which may help you work with this student:

TUTORIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

EXIT EVALUATION FORM

Please answer the following questions about yourself and your experience with our service this semester. The information will remain anonymous and confidential. We are interested in our effectiveness in helping you with your academic concerns. Your feedback can help us now and in the future.

I. Background Information (Please check appropriate response)

Classification: Freshman___ Sophomore___ Junior___ Senior___ Other___

My tutoring was paid for by:
Financial Aids___ Veterans___ Self___ Special Services___

Ethnic Identity: Anglo___ Black___ Chicano___ Native American___
Oriental___ Other_____

Course(s) in which you received tutoring_____
_____
_____

II. General Information

1. I was referred by T.A.P. to _____ department or agency.

2. My expectations of tutoring were: Met_____ Not Met_____

3. The help I received was:
very helpful 5 4 3 2 1 disappointing

4. I would recommend that my friends go there. Yes____ No____ Maybe_____

5. After tutoring, I feel more confident about my academic abilities:
Yes____ No____

6. I would feed comfortable about coming to the Tutorial Assistance Program again: Yes____ No____

7. What do you think your grade will be in the course(s) you received tutoring service:
A____ B____ C____ D____ F____ PASS____ FAIL____

8. What was your grade in the course(s) when you began tutoring?

course #1_____ #2_____ #3_____

9. Number of sessions for each course

course #1_____ #2_____ #3_____

10. Did you receive individual or group? [Place (G) or (I)]

course #1_____ #2_____ #3_____

11. Would you use this service again? yes_____ no_____ maybe_____

12. Please use this space for any general comments you would like to make. For example: What difference did tutoring make for you as it relates to your course? Good experiences, bad experiences?

TUTOR EVALUATION

We would appreciate your candid observations of your tutor this semester. It is important for us to be able to know how our staff are relating to others. The information will remain anonymous. You will be helping in designing our training and hiring procedures for future students.

Tutor's name:_____ Course:_____

	Excellent	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor
Knowledge of Subject Matter: Displayed skill and comfort with subject.				
Flexibility: Was able to change approaches and displayed innovation when faced with obstacles.				
Patience: Displayed the ability to work at a rate that was comfortable for me.				
Sense of Humor: Personable and warm without being threatening or distracting.				
Stimulating: Was able to excite your interest in the subject.				
Encouraged Independence: Was able to develop your confidence realistically.				
Dependable: Was on time and carried through on commitments.				
Understanding: Was able to listen and communicate clearly what was said.				
Equality: Had the ability to create a "we" attitude toward teaching and learning.				
Awareness of Cultural Differences: Had the ability to relate to the special concerns I had which might have been missed by someone less sensitive.				

COMMENTS WHICH YOU WOULD USE TO DESCRIBE YOUR TUTOR:

_____

_____

STUDENT TUTOR EVALUATIONS

Your involvement in this program is greatly valued by the TAP staff. Therefore, your feedback to us is of primary importance in our evaluation of this program this semester and in making plans for the next. Please be as complete as you can in answering the questions below. If there are any additional comments, suggestions, etc. you wish to give us, please feel free to include them.

I. Demographics

1. Fresh._____ Soph._____ Junior_____ Senior_____ Graduate_____ Other_____

2. Subjects tutored in:_____

_____

3. Sex: Male_____ Female_____ Age_____

4. Major:_____

II. Tutoring Sessions

1. Were the application form and tutor consultant comments useful in the first session?

very useful 5 4 3 2 1 not useful

What would you like to see accomplished in the interview to help you in the first session?

2. What problems were your students experiencing? (rank for degree of concern)

	very important					not important
subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	
study skills	5	4	3	2	1	
subject fear	5	4	3	2	1	
background lacking	5	4	3	2	1	
fear of prof/working with prof	5	4	3	2	1	
confidence	5	4	3	2	1	
personal problems	5	4	3	2	1	
anxiety	5	4	3	2	1	
apathy	5	4	3	2	1	
other_____	5	4	3	2	1	

3. What resources did you use to help your students? (check and rank for effectiveness)

used		very helpful					little to no help
____	other text materials	5	4	3	2	1	
____	tutor consultants	5	4	3	2	1	
____	study skills materials	5	4	3	2	1	
____	other students	5	4	3	2	1	
____	professors	5	4	3	2	1	
____	your personal experiences	5	4	3	2	1	
____	other campus resources (which ones)_____ _____	5	4	3	2	1	
____	Other_____ _____	5	4	3	2	1	

4. In what ways did you measure the progress of your students? Which of these criteria did you use? (Check and rank on scale of usefulness)

used		useful 5	4	3	2	1 not useful
_____	supplementary exercices	5	4	3	2	1
_____	ability to do homework	5	4	3	2	1
_____	increased interest	5	4	3	2	1
_____	kinds of questions asked	5	4	3	2	1
_____	ability to work independently	5	4	3	2	1
_____	test results/grades	5	4	3	2	1
_____	other_____	5	4	3	2	1

5. How helpful, on the average, was tutoring for your students?

very helpful 5 4 3 2 1 not helpful

6. How much time, per student per week, did you average spending in preparation?

_____

7. For your subject area what would be an optimum length of time for a tutoring session?_____

8. State two things you learned from the experience of tutoring this semester.

9. How would you define the role of a tutor?

III. TRAINING AND LEARNING EXPERIENCES

1. Which subject area meetings did you attend?

Sciences_____ Social Sciences_____ Math_____ English_____ Foreign Language_____

2. What were the major sources of your learning with this program? (Leave blank those resources you did not use.) please rank in terms of usefulness:

	very useful 5	4	3	2	1 of little help					
PEOPLE						MATERIALS					
your students	5	4	3	2	1	handouts	5	4	3	2	1
other tutors	5	4	3	2	1	study skills books	5	4	3	2	1
tutor consultants	5	4	3	2	1	tapes	5	4	3	2	1
Ms. Conner Hall	5	4	3	2	1	texts	5	4	3	2	1
other_____	5	4	3	2	1	other_____	5	4	3	2	1

PROGRAMS						COMMENTS:
orientation	5	4	3	2	1	
first general sessions	5	4	3	2	1	
tutor group meetings	5	4	3	2	1	
subject area meetings	5	4	3	2	1	
RASSL	5	4	3	2	1	
other _____	5	4	3	2	1	

3. In retrospect, what did you like most about your training/learning experience? Why?

What did you like least? Constructive criticism and suggestions would help.....

4. What recommendations for future training programs could you make?

very important 5 4 3 2 1 little or no importance

a. Organization and planning tutoring sessions----5 4 3 2 1
Comments:

b. The tutoring process:
communication skills----------5 4 3 2 1
Comments:

study skills----------5 4 3 2 1
Comments:

techniques/methods of tutoring----------5 4 3 2 1
Comments:

c. Ways of measuring student progress----------5 4 3 2 1
Comments:

d. Other----------5 4 3 2 1
Comments:

5. To what degree do you feel more confident about your own academic abilities after tutoring?

quite a lot 5 4 3 2 1 no gain

IV. WORKING WITH TAP

1. How effective and/or useful were the following to you as a tutor:

	very useful					not useful				
a. master schedule board	5	4	3	2	1					
b. intake interview form	5	4	3	2	1					
c. time sheets	5	4	3	2	1					
d. weekly report forms	5	4	3	2	1					
e. your folders	5	4	3	2	1					
f. assignment sheet (small carbon)	5	4	3	2	1					
g. student "no show" carbons	5	4	3	2	1					
h. your weekly schedule	5	4	3	2	1					
i. other _____	5	4	3	2	1					

Recommendations:

2. (New tutors this semester) How were you oriented? tape_____ in person_____

Rate the effectiveness of the session in informing you of:

	very effective					not effective				
procedures and forms	5	4	3	2	1					
resources and materials	5	4	3	2	1					
attitude and objectives of TAP in tutoring	5	4	3	2	1					

3. What learning aids did you use? (rank as to usefulness and effectiveness)

	very useful					not useful				
blackboards	5	4	3	2	1					
old notes and texts	5	4	3	2	1					
scratch paper	5	4	3	2	1					
dictionaries	5	4	3	2	1					
tape recorder	5	4	3	2	1					
study skills books/handouts	5	4	3	2	1					
other _____	5	4	3	2	1					

_____

Suggestions? _____

_____

_____

4. For tutors who participated in this program last semester: what are your reactions to the program this semester? better____ no change____ worse_____
Comments:

5. How would you define the role of a tutor consultant (master tutor)?

6. Rank the value of the following ideas for supplementary aids and programs as they would interest you and/or your students.

	to you					to your students				
	great value				no value	great value				no value
	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
review groups on special topics early in the semester (by subject area and by study skills)	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
old exams from professors	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
checklist of course objectives for assessing student progress	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
special sessions covering study approaches to specific courses	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
lists of supplementary texts and references at Reserve desk in UGL	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
special materials for courses available here	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
tapes on special topics related to tutoring	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1
other:	5	4	3	2	1	5	4	3	2	1

Thank you for taking the time, energy, and thought to complete this long yet vital feedback/evaluation for us. If you have any other ideas or comments you would like to express, please do so. Thank you for working with us.

1/19/76
WAB/sp